

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,828	01/25/2006	Hidetsugu Takagaki	060085	7933
	7590 11/01/200 TOS & HANSON, LL	EXAMINER		
1420 K Street,	-	SIMMONS, CHRIS E		
Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	11, 20 2000	1614		
				•
•	,		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		·	11/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	,	Application No	•	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/565,828		TAKAGAKI ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Chris E. Simmo	ns	1614			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	opears on the cove	er sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	Idress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING INSTRUCTION OF THE MAILING OF THE MAILIN	DATE OF THIS Co. 136(a). In no event, how did will apply and will expire te, cause the application	OMMUNICATION vever, may a reply be time SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONEI	I. hely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)⊠ 2a)⊟	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25. This action is FINAL . 2b) This since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-fir ance except for fo	ormal matters, pro		e merits is		
Dispositi	ion of Claims			•			
5)	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) 1-16 are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	awn from conside r election requirer ner. ccepted or b) □ ol e drawing(s) be hel	ment. Djected to by the I d in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	FR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do Notice of Informal F Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 1614

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-13, drawn to a therapeutic agent of formula (I). <u>Please see</u> specie election outlined below.

Group II, claim(s) 14-16, drawn to method of treating COPD using a therapeutic agent of formula (I). <u>Please see specie election outlined below.</u>

The inventions listed as Groups I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the common technical feature (i.e., a therapeutic agent of formula (I)) is not a special technical feature because these agents are taught in U.S. Pat. 6,114,352 (abstract).

Specie Election

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Art Unit: 1614

The species are as follows: the multitude of structurally and functionally distinct compounds of formula (I) that are encompassed by the claims.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single specie to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. In order to be fully responsive to this election requirement, Applicant must further elect and provide the structure of a single compound specie of formula (I). The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected specie, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 1-16.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the common technical feature (i.e., a therapeutic agent of formula (I)) is not a special technical feature because these agents are taught in U.S. Pat. 6,114,352.

Art Unit: 1614

include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must

requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims

encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To

reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the

election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not

patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection

under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Joint Inventors

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected

invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one

or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by

a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1614

Notice of Possible Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1614

Claims and Continuations Rule

Effective November 1, 2007, if applicant wishes to present more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims in an application, applicant will be required to file an examination support document (ESD) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 before the first Office action on the merits (hereafter "5/25 claim threshold"). See Changes to Practice for Continued Examination Filings, Patent Applications Containing Patentably Indistinct Claims, and Examination of Claims in Patent Applications, 72 Fed. Reg. 46715 (Aug. 21, 2007), 1322 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 76 (Sept. 11, 2007) (final rule). The changes to 37 CFR 1.75(b) apply to any pending applications in which a first Office action on the merits (FAOM) has not been mailed before November 1, 2007. Withdrawn claims will not be taken into account in determining whether an application exceeds the 5/25 claim threshold. For more information on the final rule, please see http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/presentation/clmcontfinalrule.html.

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in this Office action, applicant is required to file an election responsive to the restriction requirement. Applicant may not file a suggested restriction requirement (SRR) in lieu of an election responsive to the restriction requirement as a reply. A SRR alone will not be considered a *bona-fide* reply to this Office action.

If applicant elects an invention that is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims, applicant will not be required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims. If the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims, applicant may file an amendment canceling a number of elected claims so that the elected invention would be drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims.

If the restriction requirement is mailed <u>on or after</u> November 1, 2007, applicant is also required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims, unless the elected invention is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims. To avoid the abandonment of the application, the ESD (if required) and the election must be filed within **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this Office action. The two-month time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136.

If the restriction requirement is mailed <u>before</u> November 1, 2007, the election must be filed within **ONE MONTH** or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the

Art Unit: 1614

mailing date of this Office action. The time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136. Furthermore, if the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims, the Office will notify applicant and provide a time period in which applicant is required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 covering each of the elected claims or amend the application to contain no more than 5 independent elected claims and no more than 25 total elected claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris E. Simmons whose telephone number is (571) 272-9065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Art Unit: 1614

Page 8

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Chris Simmons Patent Examiner

AU 1614

October 19, 2007 -

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER